Questions and Answers about the Supreme Court of Ohio RFP for Hosted Case Management System 2011-1

Updated October 5, 2010

1. **(General) Who has access to the Ohio Courts Network (OCN)? How often are updates sent from local courts to the OCN?**
   Various court and justice partners are users of the OCN. Generally, courts upload new/changed case data to the OCN once per day after close of business.

2. **(1.3.4) Requirement 1.3.4 asks for the ability to search for text within stored documents. Is this a function of the CMS or the application from which document is found (e.g. Adobe, MSWord)?**
   It is the vendor's solution which determines whether the function is in the CMS or in the document's application.

3. **(1.4.4) Requirement 1.4.4 asks for authorization for printing a document requiring a judge's signature. How is that authorization to be met (e.g. password, user security)?**
   The manner in which authorization is provided should be determined by the solution.

4. **(1.5.9) Section 1.5.9 asks for ability to track online training program results. Is the expectation that this will be a function of the CMS or some other software?**
   The manner in which this capability is provided should be determined by the solution.

5. **(1.6.4) Section 1.6.4 - Can you provide an example of what type of data would need to be entered in a drop-down list? Sections 1.6.3 and 1.6.4 seem to contradict each other.**
   In general, drop-down lists should not be editable but there was a request to allow for it if possible (so the word "most" is missing from 1.6.3.) Requirement 1.6.4 is conflicting and will be deleted from the requirements.

6. **(1.8.1) Section 1.8.1 - Can you provide an example of what is meant by batch entry in this requirement? System shall allow online and batch entry of data into any data field.**
   No specific example is available, but it is possible that external systems to which the CMS might interface may not exchange data real-time. Batch entry allows the batch receipt of data which affects multiple cases.

7. **(2.6.4) Section 2.6.4 Judge Assignment - If a judge who was originally assigned automatically to case is recused, at the time of recusal, does the system automatically assign a new judge or is this a manual process?**
   Replacing a judge for any reason - recusal or other - is a manual process. BUT…the system should provide the option of allowing each court to either assign a new judge manually, or request that an automated assignment be made.

8. **(2.6.8) Section 2.6.8 - If a judge and a magistrate are both assigned to a case, is the expectation that this will be a manual process or should the system assign both automatically based on the case type entered?**
   The expectation is that either a manual selection or automated assignment could be made for both the judge and magistrate separately.

9. **(General) It appears that licensing will be done initially through the SCO for the two pilot courts. Vendors may propose an enterprise license in their proposals and also allow individual courts within the state to pursue their own contracts and licensing with the preferred vendor. Is this stated correctly?**
   Yes. Any Ohio court can contract directly with the same vendor selected to provide the SCO CMS. But it is expected that the vendor which is selected by the SCO should offer favorable terms for any court choosing to contract directly.

10. **(1.1.2) In section 1.1.2 the statement is made that courts will need to change their business processes to be compatible with the state system. If a local court installs the system, will they be allowed to contract individually with the vendor for additional modifications?**
    Yes. If a local court contracts directly for their own system from the same vendor selected in this procurement, they would not be using the "state system," which will be a shared system hosted by the SCO. The local court would be responsible for their own system.

11. **(1.1.4) Section 1.1.4 - Will local courts be allowed to select a Juror management solution that may be different from the CMS selected vendors solution?**
    Yes.

12. **(3.1.1) Section 3.1.1 indicates that the possibility may arise where a contractor/sub-contractor may not be approved by the SCO. If this occurs, will the prime contractor be allowed to partner with an additional subcontractor or does the SCO determine who the contractor/subcontractor will be?**
    The Prime is to select the replacement subcontractor. Subcontractor subject to SCO approval.

13. (General) Will local courts desiring to obtain a new CMS, etc. be required to obtain the statewide preferred system or will they be allowed to purchase non-preferred CMS systems?

Local courts will not be required to use the hosted CMS and are completely free to purchase any CMS that meets their requirements.

14. (General) Does the SCO require that the selected system be strictly browser-based (thin client) or is a n-tier solution that is distributed and communicates via the internet acceptable?

It is the intention of the SCO to have a browser-based CMS system to minimize the equipment requirements and maintenance at the user end. However, if an n-tier system can meet the system requirements and not require the SCO to maintain user end equipment and configuration we would consider it as an option.

15. (1.6.10) Section 1.6.10 – Please give an example and explain what kind of validation you would expect for data that has been copied and pasted from an external document?

As an example…if someone copied and pasted a date, the system should validate its format. The same holds true for data pasted into any field for which a specific format has been set.

16. (1.8.1) Section 1.8.1 - What is your process for online and batch entry of data? Please give an example of how this is used currently or to be used in the future.

No specific example is available, but it is possible that external systems to which the CMS might interface may not exchange data real-time. Batch entry allows the batch receipt of data which affects multiple cases.

17. (2.1.8) Section 2.1.8 - Define what you mean by the ability to set different levels of confidentially based on court defined criteria.

Different users would be able to see - or not see - data, documents, etc. based on their security rights.

18. (3.2.4) Section 3.2.4 - Please give an example of a court defined timeframe target for an event in a case.

Case flow management capabilities would enable the pre-determination of the timeliness for each next event, or duration for some activities (e.g., marriage counseling.)   Each court might need the flexibility to be able to set different timeframes for the same case type.

19. (3.5.18) Section 3.5.18 – Please explain what displaying a calendar graphically is intended to mean.

As an example, the calendar display in MS Outlook is graphical (though it can also be displayed as a list.)

20. **(3.5.27) Section 3.5.27 - Please define the process of attaching ticklers to a calendar. Please give an example.**
This would be similar to adding a calendar item with a reminder, or a task with a due-date, in Outlook. The process for doing so, however, is dependant on the solution.

21. **(Attachment 1, Section 4.2.2.1) In Attachment 1, Section 4.2.2.1 Key Personnel, the position "Project Director" is listed under Key Personnel. Please provide your definition of this position.**
The person responsible for directing the overall project - and is typically the person to whom your PM reports.

22. **(Attachment 1, Section 4.3.9) What is the total number of tables or logical tables expected to be converted per legacy system of the two pilot courts. Can you provide a complete data dictionary of the two legacy systems f including representative data samples?**
The only information we have available regarding the pilot court legacy data at this time is provided in the RFP Appendix H ? SCO Pilot Courts Databases and Imaging Systems.

23. **(Attachment 1, Section 4.3.9) Has any data quality assessment been performed against the legacy data of each pilot court and if so, can you release the findings as part of the RFP? If not, will the SCO release a representative sample of the legacy data to be converted for each pilot court?**
No data quality assessment has been performed. The SCO will provide additional detail on the pilot court data to the RFP finalist prior to contract negotiations.

24. **(Attachment 1, Section 4.3.9) What is the total number of databases anticipated to be in scope for data conversion as part of this project?**
Since it is unknown how many local courts may ultimately choose to use the SCO hosted CMS, the total number of databases to be converted cannot be determined.

25. **(1.12.10) Please describe what is meant by "end-user access authority".**
Requirement 1.12.10 is duplicative of requirement 1.12.1 and will be deleted.

26. **(1.6.11) Please provide more detail regarding this requirement, specifically what types of data will be received and stored via the stated capabilities. Please also provide a case flow example for these inputs.**
This capability would enable data entry from the scanning process, such as would be required for paper-based case filings. The process is already documented in existing document scanning use case(s).

27. **(1.6.7) Please provide an example of this functionality. Will the filtering of dropdown lists based on the selection of another dropdown field be sufficient for this requirement?**

A simple example would be the entry of a judge which then populates that judge's court location information.

28. **(1.8.1) Does this refer to batch entry of data from outside sources or batch entry of information within the CMS (i.e. updating the status on a list of cases in batch from a single screen).**
Yes to both.

29. **(2.11.6) Is the plan to have Plea Agreement form accessible via a public internet portal? Is that what is meant by "online"?**
The "plan" is that all screens and forms would be available via web browser. Online means the form would be completed using screen form(s).

30. **(2.15.4) Please explain the levels referred to in this requirement. What significance do they have?**
Requirement 2.15.4 is not applicable to this project and will be deleted.

31. **(2.22.5) At what point are the bond fees assessed on the case?**
At the point when a bond is applied to the case, or any time afterwards if changes are made.

32. **(2.4.12) What is meant by "additional qualifiers" and please provide an example.**
Courts may want to add additional characters to the case numbering that further describes the case type.

33. **(2.4.7) Please provide an explanation for what is meant by "issues" and please provide examples.**
An "issue" is a subordinate consideration in a case that may require a judge's decision. For example, in an eviction case there may be an issue with the handling of security deposit. The tracking of issues provides judges another level to find relevant cases.

34. **(2.6.11 and 2.6.12) Please provide a list of possible criteria for use in the Automated Judge assignment algorithm.**
One criteria could be the number of cases of a particular type that is already assigned.

35. **(3.10.16 and 3.10.17) Please provide examples for when these functionalities would be used.**
Any time a message needs to be sent only to those who are online, or when they login.

36. **(3.3.11) Please clarify this item. The requirement is not understood as currently stated.**

The text "(other than whomever is", is inappropriate and should be deleted. The requirement should read: "System shall have the ability to alert designated user(s) when work list items/actions are completed"

37. **(3.5.14) Does the ability to specify the number of time slots within a block of time meet this requirement, or number of cases per docket? If not, please define what is meant by "session limits" in this context.**
Yes.

38. **(4.1.11) Please provide an example of this functionality.**
Judges may need to "sign" multiple warrants - the ability to sign them with one action rather than individually.

39. **(4.5.3) Is this referring to a sort of report template that could be used for newly created ad-hoc reports?**
Not necessarily. A pre-formatted system report might be to list all cases closed during the prior month. This requirement would allow a user to select that report, but change the parameters to list all cases closed for a different time period, such as one quarter, which they only need to run one time.

40. **(5.2.20) How does the SCO envision that transfer of accounts to a collection agency to occur? Will the information be transmitted electronically through a report or through some type of interface?**
The intent of this requirement is to streamline the process for designating which accounts are to be sent to collections - but could also provide the basis for printing necessary information about the accounts, and eventually for sending data electronically when interfaces are in place.

41. **(5.2.26) How are payments from Employers currently being made? Are employers sending checks to the courts for distribution to lenders?**
This may vary be each court, but the expectation is that at a minimum, garnishments paid by check can be tracked by the system. SCO is not aware of courts collecting garnishments and distributing checks to lenders.

42. **(5.2.3) Please define "recoupable" as used in this context. Does this imply that the collected amount for the cost would be held for distribution to a third party?**
It means the ability to designate when a cost incurred by the court is to be repaid by a party.

43. **(5.3.10) Is there a predetermined list of e-commerce or credit cart processing companies that are currently being used throughout the state? Or is the assumption that the vendor should have a framework to easily integration with most providers?**
There is no predetermined list of companies. It is anticipated that the vendors solution can integrate with most providers.

44. **(5.3.9) Can we assume that the credit card information will never be stored within the CMS and it just needs to be used for interfacing/communicating with a 3rd party credit card processing company referred to in item 10 of section 5.3?**
It is not anticipated that the courts will store credit card information. All assumptions about the handling of credit card data should be driven by the vendor's compliance with PCI standards.

45. **(5.6.13) Is it implied that information from the check scanner and/or an image of the check will be transferred to and stored within the CMS? If so, what information does the CMS need to store from the Check Scanning device? Or would the check scanner be strictly used for check verification as described in item 14 of section 5.6?**
Item 5.6.14 elaborates on the resulting action (automated initiation of the verification) when a check is scanned; nothing about storing the image of the check or its data is implied. However, populating payer information fields with data read in the scan would help streamline the process and, unless court rules or law prevents it, keeping an image of the scanned check is acceptable.

46. **(5.9.9) Please list all possibilities for "electronic" payments as related to this requirement.**
Initially it would be online credit card payments. Future methods would likely include EFT via IVR.

47. **(Appendix D) Will the SCO accept variances or workarounds to the described Use Case Narratives in Appendix D as long as the solution meets the core purposes and objectives?**
Yes. The instruction in 3.14 of the Solution Proposal template requests vendors to describe the variances between their system workflow and the use cases, if applicable.

48. **(1.2.3) Does this functionality need to be accomplished via the workstation Operating System or the Case Management Application?**
How this function would operate is to be determined by the solution.

49. **(4.4.5) Can external materials be stated to mean attachments?**
This section of the requirements deals with Exhibits and Evidence. External materials would include physical items which are not attachable.

50. **(6.1.3) Is the 3/7/2008 update to the OCN interface specifications the most current artifacts?**
The current specifications are included in the RFP Appendix B1. OCN ETL Release Notes 1.70 defines all the documents and versions making up the current specification.

51. **(6.1.9) What are the specifications to include manufacturer and model for audio/visual recording equipment?**
SCO does not have equipment specifications. It is anticipated that the CMS will be able to integrate with most equipment available today.

52. **(Appendix G) Does OCN utilize Microsoft Exchange for email storage?**
OCN does not include email, however the SCO does use Microsoft Exchange for email storage.

53. **(Regarding CMS interface with Ohio department of public safety - bureau of motor vehicles, Traffic ticket automation:) what is the frequency of submission to BMV from CMS?**
The guideline from BMV is to have the submission within 10 days of the waiver/conviction/suspension. It is the intent of the SCO to have the submissions occur on a more timely basis, such as nightly as part of the workflow process.

54. **(Regarding CMS interface with Ohio department of public safety - bureau of motor vehicles, Traffic ticket automation:) What business process on the court side triggers this data flow?**
Certain entries to and/or disposition of a case.

55. **(Regarding electronic disposition reporting methods:) We request a sample disposition form for hard copy generation.**

56. **(Regarding electronic disposition reporting methods:) What role does CMS play in "An arrest finger print card will need to be forwarded to BCI before disposition can be entered in CCH" p.11 on edispo document?**

57. **(General) In the pricing template provided as part of this RFP, can the "Vendors Optional Proposal Method" column be represented for all the three categories – Pilot Phase Courts, One Incremental Court, and Total Costs for Grouping of 20 Courts. ?**
Yes.

58. **(General) For an accurate estimation of pricing, what would constitute "additional interfaces" in the pricing template under Cost Proposal Details, item 3.2? Would this be information exchanges with DRC, SCO, ACMS and ECMS, DYS, JFS, SACWIS ? Also, how many integration points are expected within each agency? For example, there could be 2 or 3 information exchanges (a.k.a. integration points) with just DRC alone.**
The current requirements for interfaces only include the three listed in the RFP which are BMV, OCN, and BCI&I. The "Proposed Additional Interfaces" is for any optional interfaces the vendor may include as part of the proposed solution.

59. **(General) Does the Supreme Court of Ohio have a target timeframe for completion of the pilot phase of the project (for 2 courts)?**

The solution proposal template item 4.3 states that SCO anticipates a pilot project prior to statewide roll-out to be completed within two years. However, 2 years would be the maximum time acceptable for the pilot phase.

60. **(General) For the pilot phase, how many scanners is the Supreme Court of Ohio planning to implement for the electronic content management system (document management system)? Is the vendor expected to quote the price for document scanners as well in addition to software?**
The SCO assumes the number of scanners may vary for each court using the system. The vendors' proposals should include the requirements for documents scanners needed to support the proposed solution. A price quote for scanners may be included in the proposal but is not required.

61. **(General) Can we have an estimate of the number of documents scanned/imaged per month for the two courts identified in the pilot phase of the project?**
We do not currently have the monthly count of documents imaged, but will attempt to provide this information as a follow up to the vendors. Note that the Holmes County Probate/Juvenile Court does not current have imaging.

62. **(General) Do you have a budget for your project?**
SCO does not have a specific targeted budget amount for the project. The purpose of the RFP is to establish the scope, timing, solution approach and estimated costs to meet the requirements as we have defined them using a "best value" based evaluation. Attachment A2-SCO CMS Cost Proposal Template includes instructions and format for the vendors to provide the estimated costs for meeting the project's requirements.

63. **(Appendix G) In Appendix G "SCO Infrastructure FINAL", it states that "Databases and applications must support SQL mirroring with automatic failover." Would the SCO accept SQL Failover Clustering as an alternative to SQL Mirroring?**
SCO would accept a SQL Failover Clustering solution. If the vendor proposes this solution, we would expect the vendor to provide a detailed description of the hardware proposed and details of the solution. Additionally, vendor will need to address how database availability will be maintained in the event of a storage subsystem failure.

64. **(Attachment 3, Item 5.6.13) Does SCO have and use scanners today or does SCO want the vendors to propose scanner equipment? If the SCO does have preferred scanner devices, please provide detail regarding them.**
The SCO does not have preferred scanner devices for the CMS. Vendor's proposal should include the recommendation for scanners.

65. **(Attachment 3, Item 5.6.13) Is it required to take and store full check image or just data to verify checks?**

Both would be ideal.

66. **(Attachment 3, Item 5.6.13) What is the expected average number of checks to be scanned/verified daily?**
SCO does not have an estimate for the number of checks to be scanned.

67. **(Attachment 3, Item 5.6.14) What is or are the Check Verification services SCO is planning to use? Can you provide details about their interfaces?**
SCO does not have a specific check verification service planned for.

68. **(RFP, Section 1.1.3, Objectives) Does SCO use any backup solutions today as a part of its infrastructure or does SCO have preferred solutions to use as a part of this project?**
Currently the Court uses a disk to disk to tape backup method using Symantec Backup Exec. SCO does not have a preferred solution. The goal is to propose a solution that will allow for rapid restoration of CMS services to the hosted Courts.

69. **(RFP, Section 1.1.3, Objectives) Can you provide detailed requirements and metrics for Disaster Recovery and Business Continuity (such as required time to recovery etc.)?**
SCO does not have specific details and metrics defined at this time.

70. **(Appendix D) In Appendix D – SCO Use Case Narratives FINAL document, there are interfaces mentioned as a part of Use Cases (such as Ohio Bar Association Attorney Registry System) which are not mentioned in the RFP document (1-SCO RFP for Court Case Mgmt System FINAL), in the Functional Requirements document (A3 – SCO CMS Functional Requirements FINAL) nor in Common Court Interfaces document (Appendix B – SCO Common Court Interfaces FINAL) as in scope. Are such interfaces not mentioned in the RFP document, Functional Requirements document or Common Court Interfaces document to be implemented in the future and are not in scope for the pilot phase of the project?**
The specific global interfaces in scope for the hosted CMS are interfaces to BMV, BCI&I, and the OCN. In addition, the vendors are to explain the options for other interfaces that may be required for each court's specific needs. For example, the ability to interface with the local jail. These court specific interfaces will be part of the implementation plan for each court, which is why the RFP requests Time and Material type pricing for additional interfacing efforts.

71. **(Attachment 1; Section 1.5) In Section 1.5.1 Vendors are asked to identify any proposed modifications to any terms and conditions "in the SCO's standard Agreement for Services". However, Vendors may choose to propose modifications to RFP terms that are addressed in other sections of the RFP (e.g. Section 3.3 Special Terms and Conditions) besides Appendix A. Is it acceptable to include proposed revisions to terms other than those in**

Appendix A in the Attachment 1.5.1 response template, assuming the location of the term in question is clearly described?
No. The sections 1.5.1-Modifications, and 1.5.2-Additions of the Solution Proposal Template are intended to be for modifications and additions to the Standards Agreement for Services. There are no other sections of the RFP where vendors are asked to propose modifications to the RFP terms."

72. **In lieu of completing the portion of the cost template for Groupings of 20 courts, may we submit an alternative option for the courts to consider, or must we complete the Grouping of 20 courts as a mandatory compliance element of our response?**
    The purpose of including cost proposals for a single court and a group of 20 courts is to understanding the impact on vendors' pricing models between implementing the CMS one court at a time, and implementing for a minimum number of courts. If the vendor has an alternative pricing option that will better reflect their business model and/or pricing scenarios we will accept an alternative option.

73. **(Attachment 5) The Reference template contains duplicate entries for "Reference Contact Telephone Number" and "Reference Contact E-mail". Should Vendors simply enter the information twice or was some other information intended for these cells? Please clarify.**
    Rows 13 through 16 are for contact information for the "Vendor Project Manager" that you had assigned to the project, while Rows 17 through 20 are for the contact information for the "Reference Contact Name" for the organization you are including as a reference.

74. **Can the vendor submit their own price sheets as "Vendor alternative options" if so can we submit more than one option?**
    Yes. However, the vendor should complete the Cost Proposal Template for the stated scenarios (e.g. Pilot Phase Courts costs, One Incremental Court at a time costs, etc.)

75. **Is it the intent for the SCO to have local courts/counties pay for their own services?**
    The SCO anticipates using a cost sharing model for ongoing support for the CMS, but the details have not been addressed at this time.

76. **(RFP Pg 3, Section 1.1.4 – Core Components) States "As an option, courts will be able to use their own document systems and link to the case in the SCO CMS." Does the OSC have a list of what document systems are currently being utilized and the courts that use them?**
    No.

77. **(RFP Pg 3, Section 1.1.4 – Core Components) States "Flexibility for the local court to select their own preferred e-filing provider." Does the OSC have a**

list of what e-filing providers are currently being utilized and the courts that use them?
No.

78. **(RFP Pg 19, Section 3.1.20 – Contract) States "The SCO may also require holdback of a portion of the payment milestone amount (as much as 25%) until the project is completed". For purposes of the holdback, please define 'project'? What deliverables/milestones will be holdback be applied to (i.e. software, services, support, etc)?**
The holdback language is part of the SCO's generic agreement template. Whether or not a holdback would be appropriate for the CMS project, and in what amount will be considered as part of the negotiation with the chosen vendor partner.

79. **(Appendix C – SCO CMS Reports and Forms) Can the SCO provide samples of these reports and forms?**
The SCO does not currently have samples of the reports and forms. The primary intent of the Appendix C is to give the vendor an idea of the type of reports and forms currently used by the various courts involved in the project. Specific reports and forms, and examples will be provided later in the process. If the vendor is basing pricing assumptions on the Appendix C please state those assumptions in the appropriate section of the A-2 SCO CMS Cost Proposal Template.

80. **(Appendix D – SCO Use Case Narratives Pg 2 – Party Entry, Narrative, Step #6) To 'automatically perform a lookup of an attorney's registration number in the Ohio Bar Association Attorney Registry system" implies having an interface to the OBAAR. Attachment 3 – SCO CMS Functional Requirements does not define any such interface. Can you please explain how you envision this use case step to be performed?**
The system reference in the narrative should actually be the Supreme Court of Ohio's Attorney Registration System, and not the OBAAR. The SCO maintains the attorney registration information. However, there is no requirement associated with providing this functionality or establishing the interface. Details of such an interface may be discussed with the selected CMS vendor as a potential future enhancement. We will correct the reference in the Use Case Narrative.

81. **(Appendix D – SCO Use Case Narratives Pg 3) Judge Assignment, Pre-Condition States "Automated assignment algorithm criteria have been pre-defined". To determine if the application matches the expected algorithm, can you please provide more information on the judge assignment algorithm?**
It is the SCO's assumption that the CMS will allow for the flexibility for each court to use different rules for judge assignments (i.e. assignment rules configured per court). However, if the vendor's system has limitations for per court

configurations, the vendor should make sure those limitations are reflected in its responses.

82. **(Appendix D – SCO Use Case Narratives Pg 8 – Waivable Appearance, Step #5b) States "System prompts clerk to select next action(s) if payment amount is less than the amount due". Can you explain this step in more detail?**
The intent of requirement 2.9.3 is to issue an alert to the clerk if a payment is entered that is less than the amount due on a waivable appearance citation. The alert would prompt the clerk for the next action to be taken such as waiving the balance, setting up a payment plan for the balance, or other appropriate actions.

83. **Would the State consider an extension to the Due date to allow more time for changes based upon the answers to the questions?**
No.

84. **States that the system will be "made available to" courts throughout the state. Will this be offered at a fee or for no charge to the courts? Is so, what are the fees or how will they be calculated?**
The SCO anticipates using a cost sharing model for ongoing support for the CMS, but the details have not been addressed at this time.

85. **The RFP states that the system "Be internet based and accessible over the public infrastructure". Does this mean that the system will use the Internet for communications versus a private wide area network?**
Yes.

86. **If using the open internet as the connection vehicle, does this imply that everything must be encrypted for security purposes?**
Yes.

87. **Will Courts who choose to use their own ECM (Section 1.1.4) also need to push images up to the proposed ECM component of the new Statewide CMS?**
Not necessarily. The requirements assume that at a minimum, the court be able to link the documents to the CMS via reference. However, if the vendor's proposed solution requires the images to be uploaded to the CMS that approach should be clearly addressed in the proposal.

88. **Does SCO wish to provide Public Access to Court *"Documents"* (specifically images of Court Documents) via the new CMS?**
At a minimum, the system should allow for public access to basic case information. Providing public access to document images was not a specific requirement but may certainly be a benefit to some or all of the participating courts.

89. If providing access to Court Documents, does SCO anticipate charging a fee to the public for access to documents (images) and if so, has a pricing model been established.
No.

90. Please describe how SCO envisions integration to the Ohio Courts Network?
Please see Appendix B - SCO Interfaces to be included in the Pilot Implementation, and Appendix B1 - OCN Interface Specifications. The requirement is to enable the CMS to upload the required case data to the OCN system. Currently, there are no requirements for the CMS system to query, or receive data from the OCN although this may be a future enhancement the SCO will consider.

91. Does SCO have interest in offering tools for auto-redaction of privacy information?
Auto redaction tools were not a specific requirement for the project, but the SCO will evaluate the value of such tools should the vendor offer them as an option within its proposal.